

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	GOPALAKRISHNAN	Examiner:	Salerno, Sarah Kate
Serial No.:	10/518,779	Group Art Unit:	2814
Filed:	June 6, 2005	Docket No.:	STFD.035US (S02-114US)
Title:	INSULATED-GATE SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND APPROACH INVOLVING JUNCTION-INDUCED INTERMEDIATE REGION		

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION/ELECTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Customer No. 40581

Dear Sir:

This communication is in reply to the Office Action dated September 27, 2007 in which a restriction/election requirement was presented. In response thereto, Applicant hereby traverses and submits as follows: Applicant traverses the characterization of the claims of Group 2 (to the extent the last sentence of paragraph 2 is understood); Applicant elects the claims identified under Group 1 (claims 1-39, 43) without traverse as to the main restriction; Applicant cancels the method of manufacturing claims which have been identified under Group 2 (claims 40-42); and Applicant elects Subspecies I (Fig. 1A and related embodiments represented in other figures and/or discussed but not disclosed in the figures), with identification of corresponding claims 1-39, 43 (subject to correction), and with traverse.

Applicant traverses the secondary/subspecies restrictions for insufficient bases. For example, the Office Action presents the conclusion that the subject claims lack unity of invention because "they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1." However, the PCT search was conducted on each of these subject claims in accordance with this same PCT Rule thereby evidencing that these claims are linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. Moreover, in response to the PCT search, the Written Opinion expressly states that the claimed invention is both novel and constituting an inventive step over the prior art. The Written Opinion further includes a clear

explanation under Section V that the claims are considered as such in a manner that would appear to be considered, under the PCT Rule 13.1, a single general inventive concept.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the secondary/subspecies restrictions for examination of all the claims 1-39, 43.

Respectfully submitted,
Crawford Maunu PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
St. Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633 x101

Date: October 23, 2007

By: _____

Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No. 32,122